

I. REMARKS

This is a divisional application of parent application Serial No. 10/170,963 and is directed to the structure of the terminal assemblies disclosed in the '963 application.

This amendment is made in response to the Office action mailed October 28, 2005, the period in which to respond has been extended to and including March 28, 2005, by the accompanying petition for a retroactive two-month extension of time.

In the subject Office Action: (1) the drawings were objected to as not showing dimensions; (2) claims 20, 22-25, 27-29, 31-36, 38, 40 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,169,324 (LEMKE et al.); (3) claims 20, 21, 26 and 35- 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,950 (YOKOYAMA et al.); and, (4) Claim 30 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter but was technically rejected on other grounds.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the Drawings. The Examiner incorrectly asserts and insists that the drawings need show dimensions. He is wrong and his objection is in violation of standard Patent Office Procedure as set forth in MPEP. Patent drawings need not be dimensioned. All that is required is that they fairly show and convey to one skilled in the art (in combination with the description) the subject matter being claimed by applicants. The Examiner raises this objection, no doubt, in the context of claim 20, where the profile of the terminal assemblies are described as having a stepped configuration. This structure is clearly shown in FIGS. 17 & 42, where one skilled in the art can clearly and simply see that the width of the upstanding wall portion is less than the base portion, thereby giving the terminal assembly the L-shaped configuration called for in the claim. This structure is fully explained in Paragraph 0070 of the pending application. The withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejections based upon prior art, the Examiner has first rejected claims 20, 22-25, 27-29, 31-36, 38, 40 and 42 as anticipated by LEMKE et al. The Examiner is incorrect in his application of LEMKE et al. for it is MPEP practice that for anticipation, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim in question. §2131. LEMKE is silent as to the subject of "differential signal terminals" as claimed in claim 20. Nor does LEMKE et al. has any upstanding wall portion with a pair of slots in which portions of the terminal extend lengthwise. Rather, in FIG. 1 the Examiner asserts that the insulative fingers 54 are the same as the upstanding wall portion. These

fingers simply have **no** slots. The terminals 58 are shown molded into the insert end portion and even embedded in the material so that the planar blade of each contact element is exposed on the surface of the finger in which it is disposed. Col. 6, lines 46-49. There are no such slots in LEMKE et al FIG. 1. If any slots exist, they occur in the body portion and not the upstanding wall portion as now claimed by applicants.

Moreover, the Examiner seems to assert that the mating connector shown in FIG. 13 of LEMKE et al. also discloses each and every element of claim 20. It does not. Its description is silent as to what type, i.e., differential signal, terminals are used in the connector 200. The terminals 498T shown in FIG. 13 are supported in an insulative insert 488B that is T-shaped, not L-shaped as claimed and in which the terminals are completely entrapped in the insulative material. No slots are present in the insulative insert. No individual slots are even shown in the outer connector body, and if they were they would be irrelevant because claim 20 calls for the slots to be in the upstanding wall portions of the insulative base and not the connector housing as is shown in LEMKE et al. The Examiner has also failed to demonstrate that the housings of the two embodiments of LEMKE et al are plated with a conductive material.

The same comments hold true for amended claim 35 for the slots recited in that claim are in wall portions on an insulative body portion and the wall portion of the T-shaped insulative body of FIG. 13 of LEMKE et al. has not slots for it is shown as molded completely about the terminal.

Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The Examiner also has rejected claims 20, 21, 26 and 35-42 as anticipated by YOKOYAMA et al. Once again YOKOYAMA et al. fails to show each and every element of the claims in question. Looking at FIG. 9 of YOKOYAMA et al. as exemplary, it can be seen that the terminals are held within a housing 12 and not an insulative insert as claimed in claims 20 or 35. There is no mention of a conductive housing into which an insulative body fits in YOKOYAMA et al. and the outer cover 12 is mentioned as being metal or conductive and in any event it is a cover and not a conductive housing as called for in Claim 20. No slots as that term is used in the claims are present in an insulative body portion that is inserted into a housing is present or even suggested by YOKOYAMA et al. Still further, YOKOYAMA et al. are silent with respect to whether the terminals are differential signal terminals. As such, YOKOYAMA et al. Cannot anticipate the claims as amended. The allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

As for ne claim 43, it is a combination of prior claims 20 and 30, which was indicated as allowable by the Examiner.

Also, in accordance with MPEP, the Examiner is requested to affirmatively state that he as reviewed all of the prior art cited by the office and submitted by applicants in the parent application.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: March 15, 2005

By: Thomas D. Paulius

Thomas D. Paulius
Registration No. 30,792

MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
(630) 527-4897